

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VERONICA GUTIERREZ, ERIN WALKER
and WILLIAM SMITH, as individuals and
on behalf of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

No. C 07-05923 WHA

v.

WELLS FARGO BANK, N.A.,


**ORDER RE PARAGRAPH 9 OF
JANUARY 30 ORDER**

Defendant.

Paragraph 9 of the January 30 order required that Wells Fargo “provide a declaration setting forth completely all time expended by it on same or on similar projects,” if it contends that any item or project was excessive (Dkt. No. 619). This means that if Wells Fargo objects to any line item for which class counsel seek fees, then Wells Fargo must supply the amount it spent on that project or task. The word “excessive” includes items that Wells Fargo believes are not necessarily too much but also inappropriate, which really boils down to the same thing; namely, it would be excessive for counsel to recover for that line item. To the extent that Wells Fargo has failed to comply with the January 30 order, the Court is inclined to accept at face value class counsel’s submission as to the dollar amount sought for recovery (without prejudice to any reduction the Court makes on its own). Nevertheless, this order gives Wells Fargo another opportunity to comply with paragraph 9 of the January 30 order. This must be done by **MARCH 26 AT NOON**. This should moot class counsel’s pending letter (Dkt. No. 655) but this order notes that this is not a discovery dispute. This should have been set forth in a normal motion, not as a three-page application.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 23, 2015.



WILLIAM ALSUP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE